

**Minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting
Monday, November 13, 2006**

1. CONVENE: 7:05 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Member Kohlstrand
3. ROLL CALL: President Lynch, Vice President Cook, Ezzy Ashcraft, Cunningham, Kohlstrand.

Members Mariani and McNamara were absent.

Also present were Planning and Building Services Director Cathy Woodbury, Assistant City Attorney Donna Mooney, Planner III Douglas Garrison, Planner II Dennis Brighton, Barry Bergman, Public Works.

4. MINUTES: Minutes for the meeting of October 23, 2006.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that page 5, paragraph 3, should be changed to read, "Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she was very pleased and *impressed* ~~impressive~~ with the environmentally friendly design elements incorporated into this project..."

Member Kohlstrand believed the statement on page 4, second to last paragraph, which read, "Member Kohlstrand noted that the 75% recycling rate of construction materials was impressive" was made by another member rather than her. Member Ezzy Ashcraft believed that she made that statement.

Vice President Cook noted that page 9, paragraph 4, should be changed to read, "She would like grass *instead of some of the shrubs in other landscaped areas...*"

Vice President Cook noted that on page 11, four conditions of approval were listed, and she wished to ensure that the sidewalk width was not obstructed or narrowed by the wells for street trees or by the bus stops, so that the pedestrian ways are a clear five feet. Ms. Woodbury suggested, "facilitate pedestrian access without obstruction." Vice President Cook agreed with that additional language.

Vice President Cook noted that page 13, she had commented that there should be a stop sign at the corner, and she would like to leave that to the discretion of Public Works. She would like the language changed to indicate that she believed there "*probably* should be a stop sign at that corner."

M/S Cunningham/Ezzy Ashcraft and unanimous to approve the minutes for the meeting of October 23, 2006, as amended.

AYES – 4 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 1

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:

Member Ezzy Ashcraft requested moving Item 7-A from the Consent Calendar to the Regular Agenda.

M/S Ezzy Ashcraft/Kohlstrand and unanimous to move Item 7-A from the Consent Calendar to the Regular Agenda.

AYES – 5 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

Vice President Cook inquired whether it would be possible to consider Item 8-B before 8-A, because she believed that one of the findings related to compatibility of design review with the rest of the center.

M/S Cook/Cunningham and unanimous to hear Item 8-B before Item 8-A.

AYES – 5 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

President Lynch noted that a speaker slip had been submitted for Item 7-A.

6. ORAL COMMUNICATION:

Ms. Clare Risley wished to comment on the extensive modeling of the Albertson's and Noah's Bagels building at Alameda Towne Centre with building permits. She did not believe there was any authority for issuing those permits, and believed their issuance appeared to be expressly prohibited under Planning Board Resolution 03-40, adopted on July 28, 2003. She noted that resolution specifically disapproved Phases III, IV-B and later phases. She believed the Albertson's remodel replacement was Phase V, and the Noah's Bagels remodel was Phase IV-B. The resolution stated on page 3, "Phase III, IV-B, and later phases are specifically not approved." She believed the resolution language was clear, while the construction proceeded. She stated that the language also stated that the developer may seek approval of the specifically disapproved phases at a later time by submittal of "a new environmental review with a traffic study conforming to California Environmental Quality Act guidelines, a new Planned Development Amendment and Major Design Review." She did not believe that had been done. She requested that no further building permits be issued for the Alameda Towne Centre, and to the extent possible, stop work on the projects until requirements for their approval as set forth in that resolution have been met, and the necessary approvals have been given.

President Lynch noted that Ms. Risley's concerns would be forwarded to the appropriate department, which would provide a response.

Ms. Woodbury advised that staff would report back, and was confident that everything was in order.

Ms. Holly Sellers expressed concern about the public hearing notice for this meeting, dated October 24, 2006, which stated at the bottom of page 2, "To assure delivery to Board members prior to the public hearing, please submit any written comments before April 3, 2006." She noted that date was obviously an error. She noted that she and her neighbor had delivered their written comments one week before the meeting (November 6, 2006), had pointed out the error to staff and inquired whether they had submitted their comments in time to be included. Mr. Garrison had confirmed that they had

met the deadline, but that they were not included in the staff report or passed along to the Board. She noted that they copied the Board, but she was disappointed that their comments were not available to other interested parties.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 7-A. **Applicant: City of Alameda (BB).** Review the bus shelter survey results and recommend City bus shelter design standards for future bus shelter locations in Alameda. (**Continued from the meeting of October 23, 2006.**)

M/S Ezzy Ashcraft/Kohlstrand and unanimous to move Item 7-A from the Consent Calendar to the Regular Agenda.

AYES – 5 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

Mr. Barry Bergman, Public Works, presented the staff report.

In response to an inquiry by Member Kohlstrand regarding the scope of these design recommendations and whether they would be standardized based on these new guidelines, Mr. Bergman replied that the recommendation was for future locations, not the bus shelters already in place. The recommended standard was written to provide some level of flexibility.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that the Transportation Commission had identified glass as the preference, followed by Plexiglas and perforated metal, if vandalism problems existed. She noted that the user survey stated that shelters with full walls provided more protection from the elements than shelters with half-walls. At the same time, there were certain locations where half-walls were necessary because a certain amount of disabled access clearance was needed. She noted that would be dictated by the particular location. She reinforced the recommendations with the additional requests for the additional 18 sites identified by the City to be installed immediately. She noted that for the ease of identity by riders, and uniformity of appearance, she believed that as shelters need to be replaced, a uniform design should be used.

The public hearing was opened.

Ms. Susan Decker was pleased to see the progress made by the City with respect to bus shelters, and was aware of the wide variety of shelter designs. She agreed that a unified look would be a benefit to riders, but was also aware of the necessity for different designs to accommodate different needs. She hoped the City would move ahead and install the 18 shelters as soon as possible since the rainy season was approaching.

Mr. David Kirwin supported the beautification of the bus stops, and making them more accessible. He understood the requests for bigger bus stops with glass and three benches, but realized they were not cost effective or accommodating for narrow sidewalks or chairbound passengers. He noted that the report stated that the Lexan was getting broken, and that the graffiti solvents were damaging it; he noted that was not the case, and added that if someone was paying for Lexan, they did not get what they paid for. He noted that there was a difference between Plexiglas and Lexan, which is a polycarbonate; Lexan is resistant to breakage and to solvents. While it is vulnerable to being etched, it stays in place if broken and does not shatter. He suggested adding a leaning bar for people who find it difficult to stand for a long period of time when the benches are too wet.

Mr. Edward Cuney, Chair, Commission on Disability Issues, expressed concern about the shelter at the corner of Santa Clara and Willow. He demonstrated the challenge he faced when approaching that shelter with a cane, and noted that he could be struck in the face by the post. He suggested that something be placed between the post and the back of the shelter so the cane could come in contact with it, but not low enough to trip the pedestrian. Alternatively, the shelter could be moved back so there would be sufficient area to walk down the center of the sidewalk. He was concerned that he had brought this to the City's attention nearly a year and a half ago.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

President Lynch wished to like to see some discussion in the staff report as it relates to the benefits of various materials and design. He realized there was a balancing act in terms of aesthetics, budgetary constraints and maintenance, as well as a cost-benefit to certain materials over a period of time. He would like to continue this item to address those concerns, and would like a more complete staff analysis of the information provided, e.g., the initial and ongoing maintenance costs of tempered glass. He also would like more analysis of the shelters that were discussed by Mr. Cuney.

Mr. Bergman noted that there were only two of those shelters in the City, with four posts but no side walls. He noted that those shelters met ADA requirements, but that did not mean that the City could not go beyond ADA requirements.

Vice President Cook expressed concern about the width and usability of sidewalks, and encroachment on them with various items that may not be useful any more.

Member Kohlstrand understood how Park and Webster Streets had their own unique shelters designs, and how flexibility in terms of materials would be necessary.

Mr. Bergman noted that there were different right of way constraints at different locations, and they generally placed the shelter back into the sidewalk near the property line. He noted that there was one exception at Park and Otis, which was designed many years ago.

President Lynch noted that more detailed discussion of constraints and rationales would be very helpful to the Board members and to the public.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft requested that this be placed on a fast track, so the commuters could have some relief during the rainy season.

In response to an inquiry by President Lynch, Mr. Bergman noted that the current year's CIP did not have this item in the budget.

Acting President Cunningham noted that the public would be able to comment on this item before City Council.

Member Kohlstrand did not feel the need to bring this item back to the Planning Board, as long as staff understood the Board's concerns.

M/S Kohlstrand/Cunningham and unanimous to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-06-47 to recommend City bus shelter design standards for future bus shelter locations in Alameda, with the modification requesting staff to examine the Board's suggestions before bringing the item to City Council, and adding a proposed schedule of implementation.

AYES – 5 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

7-B. **V06-0007 (Variance) and DR06-0090 (Major Design Review) - 1331 Sherman Street – Applicant: Casey Deshong (DB).** The applicant requests a Major Design Review approval for approximately a 198-square foot, single-story addition to the single-family dwelling and a Variance from the 20-foot rear yard setback and 40-percent lot coverage requirements pursuant to AMC Subsection 30-4.1(d)(7) and 30-4.1(d)(3). The site is located within a R-1, One-Family Residence Zoning District.

M/S Cook/Cunningham and unanimous to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-06-46 to approve a Major Design Review for approximately a 198-square foot, single-story addition to the single-family dwelling and a Variance from the 20-foot rear yard setback and 40-percent lot coverage requirements pursuant to AMC Subsection 30-4.1(d)(7) and 30-4.1(d)(3)

AYES – 5 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

Following the vote, President Lynch received a speaker slip regarding this item, and invited a motion to withdraw the approval of Item 7-B.

Ms. Mooney suggested a motion to rescind, and to open the public hearing.

M/S Cunningham/Kohlstrand to rescind the approval of Item 7-B, and to open the public hearing.

AYES – 5 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. David Maxie, 1330 Bay Street, noted that the owner of the property behind him, with a St. Charles Street address, recently requested a variance in order to add a bedroom and a bathroom. He noted that all the garages along the line backing up between St. Charles and Bay Street were probably all within six inches of the property line. He noted that the garages would be the only view from the back of the property. He noted that the house adjacent to the property was approximately four feet from the property line. He believed the owner should have his variance because the view was not different from what was already there.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

M/S Cook/Cunningham and unanimous to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-06-46 to approve a Major Design Review for approximately a 198-square foot, single-story addition to the single-family dwelling and a Variance from the 20-foot rear yard setback and 40-percent lot coverage requirements pursuant to AMC Subsection 30-4.1(d)(7) and 30-4.1(d)(3)

AYES – 5 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

8-B. **Proposed expansion and redevelopment of the Alameda Towne Centre (DG).** The focus of this workshop will be on site and building design. Information will be provided concerning applications submitted by Harsch Investment Properties. These include Planned Development Amendments PDA05-0004, PDA06-0002 and Major Design Review DR05-

0073 which include redevelopment of the southeast corner of the center (Shoreline area), a new approximately 147,000 square foot retail structure (Target), a three level parking garage, new signage and various other improvements. **The purpose of this workshop is for discussion purposes only. No action to approve or deny the project will occur at this meeting.**

Item 8-B was heard before Item 8-A.

Mr. Garrison requested a recess to address a technical issue.

President Lynch called for a ten-minute recess.

Mr. Garrison summarized the staff report and displayed a PowerPoint presentation.

President Lynch noted that on the illustrated plan, a parcel was identified as a gas station at the intersection at Otis Drive. He suggested that the wording be changed to “*proposed* gas station.”

Mr. Randy Kite, Harsch Investment Properties, displayed a PowerPoint presentation to describe the actions in Items 8-A and 8-B and the plans for the site. He noted that they were 30% into the construction, and that substantial redevelopment would be accomplished in 2007.

Mr. Jan Taylor, project architect, described in detail the building design elements of this redesign and remodel project. He displayed a PowerPoint presentation to illustrate the proposed changes, including vehicle and public transportation circulation

Vice President Cook requested visuals of buildings 800 and 900. Mr. Garrison noted that he could look for some. Mr. Taylor noted that the loading dock for building 800 would be removed and tucked into the building. He noted that the metal arcade would be pulled off, and wood trellises and two bump outs would be added to frame the entrance. He noted that building 900 (the former Mervyn's) would be examined in the future for remodeling, and plans had not yet been produced.

The public hearing was opened.

President Lynch noted that more than five speaker slips had been received.

M/S Cunningham/Kohlstrand and unanimous to limit the speakers' time to three minutes.

AYES – 5 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

The public hearing was opened.

Ms. Claire Risley expressed concern the Planning Department has recommended approval of items that had been specifically disapproved by the Planning Board. She believed that Planning Board Resolution 03-40 specifically disapproved Phases 3, 4-B and later phases. Buildings 400 and 500 were included in Phase 4-B, and she believed that resolution did not allow for this phase. She believed that a new Environmental Impact Report and traffic study, new Planned Development

Amendment and a major design review must be submitted. She believed that unless those steps had been followed, the building permits for buildings 400 and 500 may not be pulled. She noted that the staff report suggested that because permits had already been mistakenly issued for buildings 700 and 800, that there should be no complaints about more permits being issued for construction in phases that have already been specifically disapproved by the Planning Board.

President Lynch gave documents to Ms. Risley for her review regarding her assertions; he noted that if the documents were incorrect, she would be able to communicate that directly to City staff.

Mr. Kite noted that Ms. Risley's comment regarded Item 8-A, and wished to respond. He noted that their counsel was unable to attend this meeting, but that she submitted a letter which reinforced staff's position on why there was authority in place to approve building 300, as well as 400 and 500 under the Alameda Municipal Code.

Ms. Melinda Reising, Park Street, expressed concern about traffic and did not believe the Environmental Impact Report addressed those concerns in terms of how the traffic on Park Street would be impacted. She was concerned that Park Street would become an off ramp once Target opened.

Ms. Jill Reed noted that she lived at the Willows, and was concerned that the plans seemed to be piecemeal and scattered about the site. She believed there should be one EIR that addressed all the modifications. She would like to know the height of the Target store, and was concerned about traffic impacts on the side streets such as Franciscan Street. She did not believe that street should be a main artery out of the shopping center. She echoed the previous concerns voiced by the other speakers.

Mr. Michael Krueger noted that as a Transportation Commissioner, he wished to call the Planning Board to the Commission's recommendations that had not been included in the original packet. He noted that the mitigation on the left-turning bicyclists was addressed by relocating the bike path. He was pleased to see that the issue of widening the sidewalk on Park Street had been addressed. He noted that the issue on the transit mitigations was partially addressed by configuring the intersection to allow for a better turn for the buses. During the TC discussion, they discussed working with AC Transit to explore a more optimum route for the buses through the center, particularly with the potential addition of Target and a parking garage, which could add a lot of traffic congestion. He was pleased to see the addition of a sidewalk on one side of Whitehall Place, but was concerned about pedestrian accommodation and would like to see sidewalks on both sides if possible. The TC also passed a recommendation that every internal roadway should have a continuous sidewalk on at least one side. He strongly disagreed with the assessment that there was no treatment needed for the full east-west sidewalk along where the banks are located. He suggested that the parking ratio may be adjusted if parking spaces needed to be removed in order to get more pedestrian accommodations.

Ms. Alice Cleaveland, 2101 Shoreline Drive, echoed Mr. Krueger's comments about the narrow sidewalks on one side of the road. She was very concerned about the large trucks that drive through that area. She described a pedestrian-car near-miss that she had witnessed due to the lack of a sidewalk, as well as teenage pedestrians walking in the middle of the streets.

Ms. Dorothy Reid was concerned that the appearance of building 900 was still unknown, and that at 25 feet, the store was very close to the road. The traffic from Target would not be able to drive through the back. She added that the store was proposed at 90,000 square feet, which was reduced to 66,000 square feet by the mitigated negative declaration. She was concerned that the square footage kept changing. She would like the Board to give clear instructions to the applicant going forward while waiting for the EIR. She did not understand the assumption that Target would be built. She noted that the original proposal was to sell the land, and she would like to see alternative plans for the site. She was very concerned about the proposed 48-foot height of the building.

Mr. David Geshi, Gray Cliffs owner, spoke in support of this item. He believed that the small businesses in the vicinity would be benefited by the proposed Target. He noted that his business had suffered slightly from the remodeling, but believed the Target customers would also become his customers. He depended on the larger stores in the center to bring foot traffic to his business, and disagreed with those who believed construction should be stopped altogether.

Mr. Gary Blanick spoke in support of this item. He noted that he often traveled to San Leandro to shop and would rather spend the tax dollars in Alameda. He believed the traffic issues could be resolved, and believed Target would benefit Alameda and the Town Centre.

Ms. Vivian Forte was very concerned about the amount of growth the proposed buildings on this site have undergone, as well as with the pylons to be put into the ground. She would like to see more information on color treatments for the proposed project, and would prefer an earth-tone color scheme.

Mr. John Selbach spoke in support of this item and would like the project to go forward. He noted that he shops at off-Island Targets about twice a week, and that he would rather shop in Alameda.

Mr. David Perry noted that he was a pediatric dentist in the shopping center, and supported this project. He noted that his patients enjoy shopping in the improved shopping center. At this time, there is a vacant lot near the Willows facing his business, and some of his patients have experienced car break-ins. He believed the risk would be lessened with the Target in his vicinity.

Ms. Susan Pieper noted that the Willows residents did not want to face a vacant lot either, but that there were alternatives to a Target store. She did not want piecemeal development on this site, and needed to see a better EIR.

Ms. Kathleen von Martins, Powell Street, noted that she lived across the street from the shopping center, and added that she approved of the architectural improvement and addition of Target to the shopping center. She was very concerned about the traffic, security and quality of life implications for the surrounding residents.

Mr. Richard Peranon expressed concern about traffic congestion and pollution, and noted that children walking to Lum and Wood Schools and the nearby patients would be affected by the pollution. He did not object to Target itself, but would like a more appropriately sized and located store. He was concerned that the shopping center was not near a freeway, which would be more appropriate for a Target.

Mr. David Kirwin noted that many of the comments made on the Draft EIR had not been addressed, and he would like to see an overall plan before moving forward. He disagreed with using a piecemeal plan for such a large project. He was concerned about the addition of second stories in the shopping center. He was concerned about the potential increase in vandalism and graffiti, and added that he had observed that when he worked with Target in a maintenance capacity. He wanted to ensure that an unmanageable traffic situation did not develop from this project.

Mr. Tim Erway noted that he did not object to Target as a store, but added that all the Target stores he has seen are on large boulevards or off freeway exits. He commended Harsch for their work on the center so far, and believed that it looked very good. He was concerned about the increase in building heights, as well as the traffic. He did not believe this location was appropriate for a Target store. He had attended several Traffic Commission meetings, and believed the entrances should be made into real driveways with a barrier between traffic and pedestrians.

Ms. Rela Graber would like the developer to discuss pedestrian safety in addition to bicycle traffic. She had heard of two serious pedestrian accidents in the center, and believed the left-hand turn was too piecemeal to be safe. She would like the access past the Post Office to be closed off and turned into a minipark.

Ms. Lucy Gigli, Bike Alameda, was pleased to see the changes that had been made, and would comment on the bike/pedestrian items upon further examination of the plans. She was concerned about pedestrian safety at the east-west sidewalk parallel to Otis between Trader Joe's and Safeway, and would like pedestrian habits to be integrated into that plan.

Ms. Susan Decker echoed the previous speakers' compliments regarding the center, and expressed concern about pedestrian safety through the corridor cited by Ms. Gigli. She noted that she was neutral on the placement of a Target in the center, but expressed some concern that the Craftsman design might be more appropriate for smaller buildings. She submitted some design options to the Board.

Mr. James Leach, Global Perspectives Engineering Services, supported bringing more revenue into Alameda, and recognized that there would be tradeoffs. He believed the traffic leaving the Island going to other Targets would be reduced. He commended the developers for going to the extra effort of putting the parking structure below the main service. He would like the 9-foot-wide parking spaces to be widened to 10 feet from the center, and to double-stripe them.

Mr. Aron Sober noted that he was concerned about living so close to a Target store, as well as pedestrian safety for the children going to school and the beach. He was concerned about traffic congestion, pollution and noise. He was unsure how much shoppers the new center would attract.

Ms. Marilyn Schumacher noted that she would rather ride her bike to shop at a local Target rather than drive off-island. She wanted to ensure the scale would be adjusted, and noted that riding her bike to the center via Otis was a scary event for her. She inquired how the bike traffic would be routed, and asked the Board to consider pedestrian and bike safety. She requested that the shopping carts be trapped on the Target lot so they would not be left in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ms. Bobbi [Centurion] spoke in support of this item, and believed that Target offered a retail option that Alameda needed. She did not want to spend her time driving to surrounding cities to shop at Target, and would rather spend her retail dollars in town. She supported the upgrades that have been made so far.

Dr. Linda Rickerts concurred with the speakers who wish to spend their retail dollars in Alameda, but would like to see the Target store elsewhere on the Island. She believed the traffic and safety impacts would be too much for the neighborhood, and believed the Target should be located closer to the freeway. She was concerned about the target demographic for the Target stores with respect to potential crime and vandalism in the neighborhood.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Member Kohlstrand commended the developer and the architect on their responsiveness to the Planning Board and Transportation Commission's concerns regarding this project. She was pleased in general with the design. With respect to 8-A, she understood that it was within the Planning & Building Director's discretion to approve the design review. She noted that this was a high-profile, often controversial project and as a Planning Board member, she felt somewhat blindsided when she read about these approvals, tucked into another subsection for Buildings 300 and 400. While she understood the need for expediency, she also wanted the public to feel they had input in these decisions; as a Planning Board member, she wanted input as well. She had been following the Target project in Davis, California, and noted that their proposed Target store was similar in size to this proposed size on a single level. She found it very attractive and was pleased to see it would be LEED certified. She would like the architect to explore a LEED design, and inquired whether a single-story store, rather than a podium design, would be possible. She believed the current design was somewhat large and out of scale for the area.

In response to an inquiry by Member Kohlstrand when the final EIR would be available, Mr. Garrison replied that all of the comments had been taken on the Draft EIR. Staff was currently working on the document, and he estimated that it may be available in about a month.

President Lynch noted that staff may wish to respond to the comments regarding the podium design.

Mr. Kyte noted that a typical one-level Target would be about 127,000 square feet; the podium configuration was used because of the vertical transportation and loading areas, increasing the square footage to 145,000 square feet. To do a 127,000-square foot store, between 10 to 12 acres would be needed depending on landscape percentages. He noted that this site was 5.6 acres, and in order to accommodate the parking, a podium store was the only option.

In response to an inquiry by Vice President Cook whether a larger site had been considered for a one-story store, Mr. Kyte replied that they did, and because of the number of leases, it was not possible. He noted that a podium store was a relatively new concept for Target, and that about a dozen had been built for urban settings with limited parking.

Vice President Cook noted that it was important to address the larger question of shopping center

density in Alameda.

Member Kohlstrand expressed concern about the coverage on the site as it related to the extension and the elderly care facilities. She noted that it was appropriate to develop an existing shopping center with retail uses, but the question was how intense should the development and traffic be.

Mr. Kyte noted that they had put forth an application consistent with what Target wanted, and did not believe the project was being forced on anyone. They had listened very carefully to the concerns of the Board and the public with respect to the design and massing of the store, as well as what may be more appealing.

Member Kohlstrand noted that Target had not compromised on the square footage; Mr. Kyte responded that Target had inherited the 90,000 square foot stores, which have since been phased out. He noted that Target had a certain square footage in their prototype designs to serve their customer base as they deemed necessary. He added that the overall density on the site was the result of blending anchor stores and shop space.

Vice President Cook expressed concern about the density that made a two- to three-level parking structure in order to meet the parking capacity. She was less concerned about a particular tenant or the size of an individual building than the overall site plan.

Member Cunningham echoed Vice President Cook's concerns about the appropriate density for the site, and was not as concerned about having a large or small store, but rather the total GLA for the site. He also believed the public's concerns about the density and traffic impacts were a critical part of the decision-making process. He inquired about the definition of a "destination mall" was, as referred to by the developer.

Mr. Kyte noted that in his presentation, he identified the pieces that were complete and then worked around the center. He suggested that the types of users for each piece of the center being completed should be defined. He noted that the hardscape was being installed in the center court center, and that in a year, they envisioned that whole section of the mall being fully tenanted; they had commitments on a majority of the space. They had been in ongoing discussions with Mervyn's for the past few years; he believed that they appear to be solidifying their balance sheet and were ready for an economic resurgence in this region. They had approached the developers regarding a long-term commitment, as well as Harsch's expectations of them to stay; he noted that the store must be substantially upgraded. He did not believe it would be practical to reposition existing tenants elsewhere, and invited the Board and members of the public to examine the large model of the shopping center they had displayed at the center.

Member Cunningham noted that he supported the site, but was still concerned about the GLA for the site.

Mr. Kyte noted that they had tried to be responsive and open with the Board and the community with respect to their concerns and issues; they intended to work to find a solution to address those concerns.

Member Cunningham inquired whether a traffic review of the ingress and egress points along Otis Drive. Mr. Garrison replied that it did concern staff and had been addressed; they had examined queuing on Otis I their analysis. Member Cunningham expressed concern about pedestrian and bicycle safety in that area.

Vice President Cook expressed concern that some of the original 1993 conditions were not being met, and inquired about their legal status. She was hesitant to make any more approvals until the status of the previous approvals was clarified.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft shared Vice President Cook's concerns regarding the previous approvals.

Ms. Woodbury advised that staff would examine the rest of the conditions closely to ensure that everything went forward as it should.

Ms. Garrison noted that Building 600 West, 700 and 800 were publicly noticed extensively, and staff received fewer than six people showing any interest; the people who examined the plans at the Planning Department said they were fine. He personally called several members of the Planning Board to invite them to examine the plans, and they said it seemed routine.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft suggested that all Planning Board members receive the same notice as the members of the public receive. She would like to be made aware of those items.

Ms. Woodbury concurred, and noted that Board notification should be part of the process in the event of a staff-level design review. She noted that staff would rectify that situation, and apologized to the Board members who had not received notices.

Member Kohlstrand wished to revisit the east-west connector, which had been a condition of approval. She was also concerned about Whitehall Place and Franciscan Way, and recalled a comment by the architect that the streets were not wide enough to accommodate sidewalks on both sides. She understood that they were private roads, and that the parking bays could be bumped back to accommodate sidewalks on both sides; she would like that possibility to be considered. Because the truck loading would be accessed off of Whitehall, she inquired whether the trucks would enter on Willow because of the width of the internal streets. She inquired about the latest iteration of that design, and believed there should be a continuous sidewalk along the north side of Franciscan Way. She noted that the intersection of Franciscan Way and South Shore Center Drive had not been mentioned, and mentioned that the developer seemed to improve that intersection through the Albertson's redesign but had not seen it.

President Lynch noted that because of the lateness of the hour, a motion to continue the meeting would be needed.

M/S Kohlstrand/Cunningham to extend the meeting to 11:30 p.m.

AYES – 5 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

President Lynch noted that if it was the Board planned to prioritize pedestrian walkways, that should

be specifically stated. He believed there must be a balance struck in that case, which may be a reduction in parking or square footage. He noted that it was the developer's business to understand the economics of a project, and suggested that as the developer discusses the plan for the site, that was the point where the Board and the community ask for clarification. He understood that a balance must be struck.

Member Kohlstrand believed the presentation about the pedestrian enhancements were very positive, and she was most concerned that the intersection at Whitehall Place and Franciscan Way would be addressed. She recalled the comment made during the public hearing regarding the appropriateness of the Craftsman style, and noted that she liked the articulation presented in the design, although it was a huge structure. She was unsure about the design solution, but believed the developer should take that design comment to heart in deciding what the best design solution would be. She recalled the comments about the color schemes, and inquired whether it would be red or another color scheme more in keeping with Alameda.

Member Kohlstrand expressed concern with respect to the Transportation Commission's recommendation of establishing three lanes with a bidirectional turn lane on Park and Shoreline. She was concerned that this mitigation measure implied a loss of parking and treatment along the street that would make it even harder for pedestrians to cross those streets. She realized that would be clarified with the environmental document, and would like more emphasis on alternative modes of transportation. She believed that turning lanes should be more focused at the area where they would be needed, rather than a continuous treatment of the whole street.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft reflected on the public comments expressing concern about crime and vandalism, and wondering why Alamedans flocked to out-of-town Targets if there was a problem in that area. She noted that Alamedans were not known for leaving the Island to an unsafe destination.

Vice President Cook concurred with Member Ezzy Ashcraft's comment, and believed that Target appealed to a wide range of shoppers. She believed it would be a benefit to have a Target in the City.

President Lynch believed that the discussions within the development team should begin with improvements in the infrastructure.

A discussion of circulation in the internal roads ensued.

Mr. Kyte noted that they would consider the many comments and return with an in-depth session. He invited the public to see their large model as a prelude to a study session. He would like to resolve the issues and work towards the remaining key issues such as the size of the Target.

No action was taken.

President Lynch noted that 10 speaker slips for Item 8-C had been received.

President Lynch noted that Member Ezzy Ashcraft temporarily left Chambers, and added that Item 8-C would be heard before Item 8-A.

8-C. **UP06-0015 and UP06-0016 – Harsch Investments Realty LLC – 2215 South Shore Center (BS/DG).** The applicant requests approval of Use Permits allowing operation of a Health Studio (Fit-Lite) between the hours of 6 am and 10 pm in an existing retail space in Alameda Towne Centre (formerly South Shore Center). The Use Permits are required for health studios in the Central Business (C-2) District and for the extended hours of operation.

Vice President Cook noted that a staff report would not be necessary.

The public hearing was opened.

There were no speaker slips.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

M/S Cunningham/Kohlstrand to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. P-06-49 and PB-06-50 to approve Use Permits allowing operation of a Health Studio (Fit-Lite) between the hours of 6 am and 10 pm in an existing retail space in Alameda Towne Centre (formerly South Shore Center). The Use Permits are required for health studios in the Central Business (C-2) District and for the extended hours of operation.

AYES – 4 (Ezzy Ashcraft, Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN - 0

M/S Kohlstrand/Cunningham to extend the meeting to 12:00 midnight.

AYES – 4 (Ezzy Ashcraft, Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN - 0

9. WRITTEN COMMUNICATION: None.

10. BOARD COMMUNICATION:

a. Oral Status Report regarding the Northern Waterfront Plan (Vice-President Cook).

Vice President Cook advised that there was nothing new to report.

b. Oral Status Report regarding the Oakland/Chinatown Advisory Committee (Board Member Mariani).

Member Mariani was not in attendance to present this report.

c. Oral Status Report regarding the Transportation subcommittee (Board Member Kohlstrand).

Member Kohlstrand advised that there had been no further meetings since the last report.

- d. Oral Status Report regarding the Alameda Climate Protection Task Force (Board Member Cunningham).

Member Cunningham noted that no meetings had been held.

12. STAFF COMMUNICATION:

President Lynch noted that the Planning Board meeting of November 27, 2006, had been cancelled.

President Lynch noted that mandatory ethics training must be completed by the end of 2006.

Ms. Woodbury noted that free ethics training was available on the Internet.

8-A. 2245 S. Shore Center (old Walgreen's Building) Major Design Review File No. DR06-0081; 2246 S. Shore Center (old Ross building): Major Design Review File No. DR06-0096; 2293 South Shore Center (Petco building) Major Design Review File No. DR06-0096. (DG).

Mr. Garrison presented the staff report and recommended approval of this item.

In response to an inquiry by President Lynch why the tower needed to be at its design height, Mr. Jan Taylor, project architect, noted that Building 300 in front of Walgreen's was approved and the design was changed to add a mezzanine. He noted that the building was six to eight feet higher than Trader Joe's and that the interior allowed greater flexibility. The tower was intended to establish the identity of the shopping center in a positive way, and that it was comparable to the tallest portions of the Willows.

President Lynch noted that 10 speakers slips had been received

M/S Cunningham/Kohlstrand and unanimous to reduce the speakers' time to three minutes.

AYES – 5 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN - 0

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Tim Erway noted that his question about the height had been answered, and believed the parking arrangement in front of Trader Joe's was unsafe. He suggested that future parking schemes not incorporate the "direct-in" parking.

Mr. Michael Carr noted that he would have preferred to hear Item 8-A before 8-B. He believed it was important to keep the architectural elements intact on the topic discussed, and believed it was important to keep the discussion point of the center of the mall separate from the Target portion of the shopping center. He believed the rest of the shopping center should not be drawn into the contentiousness of the Target segment, which he also favored.

Mr. Michael Krueger did not believe any part of the shopping center could be considered unimportant, and believed the last drawings showed the buildings increasing in height towards Safeway. He believed the tower on one side of the center begged the question of what element would match it on the other end. He did not support approaching the design of the shopping center in a piecemeal fashion.

Ms. Holly Sellers noted that she had read the meeting minutes from 2003 that led up to Resolution PB-03-40, which showed that the Board worked long and thoughtfully to craft the resolution. She believed the Board wanted to be involved as the project progressed, and provided checks and balances so that the development would not get out of control, as she believed it was doing. She urged the Board not to approve this design review because she believed that that Resolution Page 4, only Phases 1-A, 2-B and 4-A may be constructed. She did not believe the architect's site modifications to the Park Street North Drive should be included.

Ms. Dorothy Reid noted that she understood the resolutions in 2003 would direct the process as written. She believed that when a redevelopment plan was submitted, that trumped any existing entitlement if they planned to do the development. She believed this was a different design, and inquired what could be expected with this PDA. She was concerned that building a 48-foot-tower might set a precedent, and was not convinced that South Shore needed a marker for identification. She would like to see some options that were not as tall.

Ms. Cathy Leong noted that she was former president of the Alameda Chamber of Commerce, and urged the Planning Board to allow Harsch to move forward with the plans for buildings 300, 400 and 500 as designed. She was concerned that if the plans continued to be delayed, the City would not reap the benefits of the tax revenues and that the tenants would not wait indefinitely for resolution of this issue. She noted that a piecemeal approach was a common reality of retail centers. She believed this shopping center was finally making a long-awaited turnaround, and urged the Board to support smart business development. She believed Target's underground parking would not be a security issue, and noted that she grew up near Target's headquarters. She concurred that Alamedans do not go to where there was trouble. She believed that the silent residents of Alameda that do not attend the meetings spoke during the election and would support this project.

Mr. Randy Kyte, Harsch Development, noted that this was a redevelopment of an existing shopping center, and was not a ground-up development; he noted that a piecemeal approach was normal for such a situation. He noted that the tower could be lowered, but did not believe that would be the proper design approach to take for that building; he disagreed with the "piecemeal" label, and noted that in a year, a design would be available for the Board to examine with the exception of Building 900.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

President Lynch wished to address the assertions made by some speakers that the resolutions approved in 2003 should be adhered to by this Board. He advised that the staff report included the new resolutions that would become the resolutions of record if this item were to be approved.

Member Cunningham agreed with the architect that a corner element would be a benefit to the center. He believed the scale and size matched the larger stores in the center such as Safeway.

Member Kohlstrand noted that there were quite a few one-story buildings in the center that are between 33 to 38 feet high, and expressed concern about the increasing height in the center.

Vice President Cook shared the concerns about the bootstrapping of the compatibility of the scale of the existing center, and believed the project had become even bigger than what had been just built. She was unsure whether she could make the finding that the project was compatible with the rest of the site and neighboring properties. She would need to hear from the City Attorney and Planning Director regarding the PDA.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether there was a specific condition in the previous resolution that was problematic. Vice President Cook noted that condition about the internal circulation was a significant for her, as well as the number of bus stops and parking space locations. She liked the

design and was excited about the new tenant. She inquired why the corner tower must be 10 feet taller than the highest point of the Safeway building. She suggested imposing height limits to safeguard against newer phases becoming higher and higher. She was not wedded to the earlier resolution suggesting that a unified style and theme fitting the 1950s – 1970s period.

President Lynch understood the challenges faced in taking over an existing shopping center and the resulting piecemeal approach. He noted that change was an important element of planning, and given the scale of the structures, these three buildings were consistent with what was already in place. He agreed that the tower was a prominent visual statement, and that within a retail complex, this plan was consistent with land use, the adopted design for the site and zoning. He was concerned with some of Vice President Cook's comments as they relate to some of the already-approved conditions, which he perceived as a separate item.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that the appearance of much of the center is known, which would supply a design standard for the rest of the center. She believed the overall design was attractive.

Member Cunningham noted that he could support buildings 400 and 500, which he believed fit the existing character; he was concerned about the massing of building 300. He suggested setting building 300 back to mitigate the height.

President Lynch noted that it was 11:58 p.m.

M/S Cook/Kohlstrand and unanimous to continue the meeting to 12:30 a.m.

AYES – 5 (Mariani, McNamara absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN - 0

Mr. Kyte noted that the tower was 38-feet-4-inches, the low parapet was 37-feet-4 inches and the next step was 40-feet-4-inches, as opposed to Safeway at 38 feet 9 inches and 33 feet 8 inches. He believed the tower could be reduced by several feet, and added that the equipment could be screened by leaving the center section a bit taller while the main body of the parapet could be lowered about two feet and four feet on the tower.

Member Cunningham believed that reducing the parapets would accentuate the tower; he was more concerned about the parapets than the tower.

A discussion of the tower height and number of floors ensued.

Vice President Cook expressed concern about the safety of the internal circulation at Whitehall to Park Street, and added that it was already dangerous at Safeway and Trader Joe's. She did not wish to continue the circulation problems in this center. She would prefer to see a walkway between Safeway and the old Walgreen's building.

Member Kohlstrand believed the design of building 500 could be improved, and was concerned with the blank facades in the east and south sides.

M/S Cunningham/Ezzy Ashcraft to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-06-48 to approve

Cathy Woodbury
Secretary, Planning & Building Department

These minutes were approved at the December 11, 2006, Planning Board meeting. This meeting was audio and video taped.